

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed June 18, 2004, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks and amendment have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 20-22 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 6-19 have been cancelled. New Claims 20-22 have been added. Claims 1, 4, and 5 are rejected. Claims 2-3 are objected to.

The objection to Claims 1-5 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the errors cited in the Office Action, and is submitted to overcome the objections under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a). Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 3-5 depend from Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to Claims 1-5 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) objection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form and amended to overcome the 1.75(a) objection. Claim 2 has been canceled and independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations from Claim 2. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Smith.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent Claim 1 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 4-5 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 4-5 are likewise patentable over Smith.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection be withdrawn.

The objection to Claims 2 and 3 as containing allowable subject matter but depending from a rejected parent claim is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form and amended to overcome the 1.75(a) objection. Claim 2 has been canceled and independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations from Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to Claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claim 3 depends from independent Claim 1 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 3 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claim 3 is likewise in condition for allowance.

With respect to newly added Claim 20, Claim 3 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form and amended to overcome the 1.75(a) objection. Independent Claim 20 has been newly added to include the recitations of Claim 3, in independent form, including the recitations of all base claims. Accordingly, Claim 20 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Newly added Claims 21-22 depend from newly added independent Claim 20, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 21-22 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 20, Applicant submits that Claims 21-22 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert B. Reeser IN  
Registration No. 45,548  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070